30 September 1958



MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

On 29 September Mr. William Foster convened the U.S. delegation to Technical-Military Experts Talks on Surprise Attack Safeguards. The principal members attending included Mr. Gordon Gray, Lt. Gen. Clovis E. Byers, Mr. Julius C. Holmes, and Dr. G. B. Kistiakowsky.

Mr. Farley briefed the delegation on the meeting of 26 September attended by Herter, Quarles and Killian. It very quickly became apparent that State was prepared to discuss agenda items which Lt. Gen. Byers felt would put the U.S. at a disadvantage and therefore the Technical Experts should not proceed beyond the observation and inspection aspects of the problem. Lt. Gen. Byers stressed that any political topics were outside the scope of the agenda and the delegation should refuse to discuss them. He stated that a new group should be formed to discuss political aspects. The concensus of the discussion appeared to be that unless and until the technical discussions created an atmosphere of mutual understanding and confidence there is no prospect for accomplishing anything useful by engaging in non-technical discussions. Giving the Soviets an advance agenda was discussed and concluded to be poor tactics.

Mr. Gray stated that he did not advocate any point of view but pointed out that since this problem does not go to the MSC it is necessary for the committee of 3 to resolve differences and arrive at an agreed approach to the proper agenda tepics.

Mr. Farley stated that the delegation needs to arrive at methods for dealing with various proposals which the Soviets are almost certain to raise during the discussions. Mr. Foster amplified the need for such alternative methods of response. These preparations, he said, would be educational work and might not be used but he urged Lt. Gen. Byers to ascertain the state of completion of appropriate JCS studies.

Mr. Foster noted that in the studies which had come to his attention there was no treatment of clandestine introduction of nuclear weapons. When Lt. Gen. Byers stated that this was not yet being studied by his staff I offered to provide such intelligence as was available in National Intelligence Estimates.

Dr. Kistiakowsky raised the subject of the degree of disclosure permissable concerning V.S. technical developments, i.e., capability of U.S. photographic equipment to provide resolution of objects photographed, capabilities of various V.S. detection systems to provide useful intelligence, etc. He stressed that at the nuclear energy conference it had been necessary for the V.S. representatives to volunteer certain information and only after such an opening would the Seviets discuss the subject in a profitable manner.

The delegation discussed the attached Tentative Schedule of events and noted the short deadline for preparation. In answer to Mr. Foster's query on office space he was informed that in two or three days offices would be available in Jackson Place for the delegation and a staff of about 25.



25X1A9a

Attachment - Tentative Schedule

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

	•
September 26	Cabinet Committee meets (Herter, Quarles, Killian) to review basic approach.
September 29	Foster convenes U. S. delegation.
October 1	NAC considers reply to USSR note, and question of composition of Western delegation.
October 3	Assignments of papers to be drafted.
October 6	Completion of U.S. draft of major talking points to be taken up at first meeting of MATO team.
October 10	First meeting of Western side in Paris (in Washington?) (selected group only attending from U.S. element).
October 17	Paper on general approach and agenda outline given to NAC.
October 20	Drafts of U.S. papers approved by U.S. delegation.
October 22	MAC approves approach, outline/agenda for transmission to USSR.
October 25	Discussion of selected position papers with Western side.
October 26	Modified outline/agenda transmitted to USSR.
November 5	Delegation convenes in Geneva.
November 10	Meeting opens.
December 13	Meeting ends.